The impact of predation losses on wildlife ranches in Limpopo Province, South Africa

9th International Wildlife Ranching Symposium Safari Hotel, Windhoek, Namibia 12-16 September 2016

Anche Schepers, Walter van Niekerk, Nicolette Matthews & <u>HO de Waal</u>

ALPRU [Africal Large Predator Research Unit / Canis-Caracal Programme (CCP) Department of Animal, Wildlife and Grassland Sciences <u>dewaalho@ufs.ac.za</u>

T: +27(0)51 401 9111 | info@ufs.ac.za | www.ufs.ac.za



Copyright reserved Kopiereg voorbehou UNIVERSITY OF THE FREE STATE UNIVERSITEIT VAN DIE VRYSTAAT YUNIVESITHI YA FREISTATA



Presented against the backdrop of Coordinated Predation Management

- discussed in the context of

Livestock Production

Wildlife Ranching

Biodiversity and Conservation



South Africa is endowed with diverse flora and fauna

... many large African herbivores have disappeared from the landscape ...

... except when contained behind appropriate fences ...

... similarly many large African carnivores have disappeared from the landscape, except when confined behind appropriate fences







Photo credits: Willie Combrinck, Nico Smit, Julia Salnick

Some large African herbivores are very dangerous ...

... these large herbivores are easily contained behind appropriate fences, but they eat



Photo credits: Willie Combrinck

The large African carnivores are very dangerous ...

Nico Smit, 2004

... large carnivores can be contained behind appropriate fences, but they still eat flesh ... G van Wyk, 2005

Nico Smit, 2004

Masequa (Du Plessis & Smit, 2005)



Photo credits: Willie Combrinck, Nico Smit, Julia Salnicki, Nico Avenant



The logical question: what is the impact of predation losses on livestock?

Van Niekerk, 2010 more than ZAR 1.39 thousand million for sheep and goats in 5 Provinces

Badenhorst, 2014 • more than ZAR 383 million • for beef cattle in 9 Provinces

... but what about wildlife?





Springbok and Dorper lamb predated on the same farm (Japie van Wyk, Brandvlei district, 10 August 2016)

Canis-Caracal Programme

The next logic question: What is the impact of predation on the wildlife ranching industry?



. the study by Schepers, 2016 ...



Number and distribution of members of Wildlife Ranching South Africa (WRSA) and the adjusted proportion of respondents selected for the study

Source: Wildlife Ranching South Africa

Province	Total number of WRSA members	Percentage of WRSA members	Number of WRSA members sampled	Percentage of WRSA members sampled in each province
Gauteng	147	7.78	0	0
Kwa-Zulu Natal	69	3.65	3	4.35
Limpopo	863	45.64	201	23.29
Mpumalanga	76	4.02	4	5.26
Northern Cape	119	6.29	8	6.72
North West	264	13.96	61	23.11
Eastern Cape	137	7.24	10	7.3
Free State	157	8.3	64	40.76
Western Cape	59	3.12	2	3.39
Total	1891		353	

Structured questionnaire

focused on a range of general questions, namely:

- name, age and gender of the wildlife rancher
- size of the wildlife ranch
- topography of the wildlife ranch
- presence of livestock on the wildlife ranch
- economically important wildlife species
- measuring predation on the wildlife ranch

followed by detailed and specific questions, namely:

- predation status and records
- predation control methods (non-lethal and lethal)
- person(s) responsible for conducting predation management

Different groups of wildlife species (antelope)

A method was developed to compare the wide range of wildlife species (antelope) on wildlife ranches ...

Wildlife species (antelope) were divided into three groups based on the reported predation losses incurred on wildlife ranches, namely:

- large antelope species
- small antelope species
- scarce species/colour variant antelope

Based on information provided by WRSA members, three groups of wildlife species (antelope) were defined

Large species		Small species		Scarce species/colour variants	
Wildlife specie	Scientific name	Wildlife specie	Scientific name	Wildlife specie	Scientific name
Kudu	Tragelaphus strepsiceros	Impala	Aepyceros melampus	Livingston eland	Tragelaphus oryx
Nyala	Tragelaphus angasii	Blesbok	Damaliscus pygargus	Black impala	Aepyceros melampus
Blue wildebeest	Connochaetes taurinus	Bushbuck	Tragelaphus scriptus	Golden wildebeest	Connochaetes taurinus
Gemsbok	Oryx gazelle	Rhebok	Redunca fulvorufula	King wildebeest	Connochaetes taurinus
Red hartebeest	Alcelaphus buselaphus	Reedbuck	Redunca arundinum	Yellow blesbok	Damaliscus pygargus

Results & Discussion – focus on Limpopo Province



Predators implicated for losses of large wildlife species (antelope) on wildlife ranches of WRSA members in the Limpopo province



Predators implicated for losses of small wildlife species (antelope) on wildlife ranches of WRSA members in the Limpopo province



Predators implicated for losses of scarce species/colour variant wildlife species (antelope) on wildlife ranches of WRSA members in the Limpopo province



Wildlife ranchers not using methods to prevent or control predation, 34%

Wildlife ranchers using methods to prevent or control predation, 66%

Shooting; 125

Number of WRSA members using <u>lethal</u> control methods to control predators in the Limpopo province

Poison; 5

Foothold trap; 7



Percentage of people responsible for managing predation on the wildlife ranches of WRSA members in the Limpopo province

Number of WRSA members using <u>non-lethal</u> control methods & other methods assisting wildlife ranchers to manage predation in the Limpopo province



Common names, scientific names of wildlife species reported by the respondents, as well as the average auction prices (ZAR) for these species during 2014 & 2015

Species named by wildlife			Average ZAR
ranchers	Scientific name ¹	Common name ¹	2014/15 ²
African buffalo	Syncerus caffer (Sparrman, 1779)	African buffalo	999 941
Black wildebeest	Connochaetes gnou (Zimmerman, 1780)	Black wildebeest	4 514
Blesbok	Damaliscus pygargus phillipsi (Pallas, 1767)	Blesbok	4 153
Blesbok (copper)			
Blesbok (masked face)			949 330
Blesbok (white)			
Blesbok (yellow)			
Blue wildebeest	Connochaetes taurinus (Burchell, 1823)	Blue wildebeest	14 495
Blue wildebeest (golden)			
Blue wildebeest (king)			1 230 486
Blue wildebeest (split)			
Bontebok	Damaliscus pygargus dorcas (Pallas, 1767)	Bontebok	121 817
Bushbuck	Tragelaphus scriptus (Pallas, 1766)	Bushbuck	21 282
Cape Grysbok	Raphicerus melanotis (Thunberg, 1811)	Cape Grysbok	24 417
Common duiker	Sylvicapra grimmia (Linnaeus, 1758)	Common duiker	13 788
Common ostrich	Struthio camelus (Linnaeus, 1758)	Common ostrich	8 518
Common warthog	Phacochoerus africanus (Gmelin, 1788)	Common warthog	400
Eland	Tragelaphus oryx (Pallas, 1766)	Eland	9 325
Eland (Livingston)			282 430
Fallow deer	Dama dama (Linnaeus, 1758)	Fallow deer	5 227

Table continues ...

Common names, scientific names of wildlife species reported by the respondents, as well as the average auction prices (ZAR) for these species during 2014 & 2015

Gemsbok	<i>Oryx gazella</i> (Linnaeus, 1758)	Gemsbok	ZAR 8 496
Gemsbok (golden)			
Gemsbok (painted)			372 437 ³
Giraffe	Giraffa camelopardalis (Linnaeus, 1758)	Giraffe	12 931
Greater kudu	Tragelaphus strepsiceros (Pallas, 1766)	Greater kudu	33 923
Greater kudu (white)			586 667
Grey rhebok (Vaalribbok)	Pelea capreolus (Forster, 1790)	Grey rhebok (Vaalribbok)	10 750
Impala	Aepyceros melampus (Lichtenstein, 1812)	Impala	8 643
Impala (black)			
Impala (black-backed)			
Impala (colour variant)			684 761 ³
Impala (split)			
Impala (white)			
Klipspringer	Oreotragus oreotragus (Zimmermann, 1783)	Klipspringer	22 063
Lechwe	Kobus leche (Gray, 1850)	Lechwe	67 758
Mountain zebra	<i>Equus zebra</i> (Linnaeus, 1758)	Mountain zebra	4 809
Nyala	Tragelaphus angasii (Gray, 1849)	Nyala	24 165
Oribi	Ourebia ourebi (Zimmermann, 1783)	Oribi	-
Plains zebra	<i>Equus quagga</i> (Gray, 1824)	Plains zebra	4 809
Red hartebeest	Alcelaphus buselaphus (Pallas, 1766)	Red hartebeest	7 462
Roan	Hippotragus equinus (Desmarest, 1804)	Roan	544 531
Sable	Hippotragus niger (Harris, 1838)	Sable	787 645
Southern reedbuck (Rietbok)	Redunca arundinum (Boddaert, 1785)	Southern reedbuck (Rietbok)	17 113
Springbok	Antidorcas marsupialis (Zimmermann, 1780)	Springbok	2 861
Springbok ("bont")			
Springbok (black)			
Springbok (coffee hartwater)			210 872 ³
Springbok (coffee)			
Springbok (copper)			
Springbok (hartwater)			
Steenbok	Raphicerus campestris (Thunberg, 1811)	Steenbok	29 887
Tsessebe	Damaliscus lunatus (Burchell, 1823)	Tsessebe	113 229
Waterbuck	Kobus ellipsiprymnus (Ogilby, 1833)	Waterbuck	5 991
¹ Bronner et al. (2003)			

² Dr. Johann Reyneke (WildSA & Gamelab) & Dr. Paul Lubout (Wildlife Stud Services & Gamelab) December 2015

Total cost due to predation for a selection of wildlife species (antelope) reported by respondents in the Limpopo province

	Average ha	Average number of wildlife lost/ha	Indirect cost/ha	Average wildlife prices	Total cost (ZAR) due to predation
	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5
Large species					
Nyala	2 147.09	0.00416	26.15	24 165	252 898.00
Blue wildebeest	2 436.17	0.00220	26.15	14 495	119 735.32
Kudu	2 520.85	0.00399	26.15	33 923	384 713.90
Gemsbok	3 668.23	0.00292	26.15	8 496	154 316.27
Red hartebeest	2 249.36	0.00251	26.15	7 462	80 953.61
Small species					
Impala	2 265.05	0.02162	26.15	8 643	462 345.77
Rhebuck	6 730.00	0.00084	26.15	10 750	176 931.70
Bush buck	1 754.44	0.00526	26.15	21 282	226 679.47
Reedbuck	1 150.83	0.00232	26.15	17 113	65 553.76
Blesbok	1 905.67	0.00927	26.15	4 153	106 256.94
Scarce species/colour variants					
Black impala	2 166.75	0.00110	26.15	684 761	1 669 474.59
Golden wildebeest	930.05	0.00243	26.15	1 230 486	2 796 977.48
King wildebeest	1 270.00	0.00354	26.15	1 230 486	5 553 939.16
Livingston eland	1 671.07	0.00411	26.15	282 430	1 968 599.50
Yellow blesbok	1 000.00	0.00600	26.15	949 330	5 713 240.00

The total cost is a summary of the wildlife species included in the study. Column 1 - the average ha of the wildlife ranchers who responded in the study for the specific species. Column 2 - the average number of each of these species lost/ha. The indirect cost for the dissertation was estimated at ZAR 26.15/ha (Column 3). Column 4 the average prices during 2014. The total cost was calculated by multiplying the average ha (Column 1) with the average number lost/ha (Column 2) with the average 2014 price (Column 4) and adding the indirect cost/ha (Column 3) multiplied with the average ha (Column 1).

Baseline information was calculated for the three defined groups of wildlife species (antelope)

Wildlife ranchers can use the baseline information to <u>estimate</u> the <u>financial losses</u> for the <u>specific wildlife species (antelope) kept on</u> <u>their wildlife ranches</u>, for example:

Large species

- only nyalas Tragelaphus angasii on 5 000 ha
- total cost of predation losses = ZAR 593 765/year

Small species

- only blesbok Damaliscus pygargus phillipsi on 12 000 ha
- total cost of predation losses = ZAR 668 103/year

Scarce species/colour variants

- <u>only</u> black impala Aepyceros melampus and Livingston eland Tragelaphus oryx on 6 000 ha
- total cost of predation losses = ZAR 11 957 637/year
 Financial losses can be calculated for different permutations/species mixes

The reality is - red blooded animals are "fair game" for predators ...

The impact of predation on livestock and wildlife is widespread and must be managed ...



A system of coordinated predation management can reduce the impact of predation



Credit Farmers' Weekly



Activities must be coordinated ... and lessons learnt applied ...

... leadership needed to coordinate ...

... implementation is long overdue and progress slow and frustrating ...

... while uncoordinated and fragmented activities continued ...

